



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 105/10

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, April 7, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen, Chair
Jerry Finrow
Mark Hannum
Christine Howard
Patrick King
Aaron Luoma
Steve Savage
Marie Strong
Tom Veith, Vice Chair
Elaine Wine
Meredith Wirsching

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Alyce Conti

Chair Vernon Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

040710.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of February 3, 2010

MM/SC/TV/CH 9:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

Public Disclosure/Disclaimer Statement

Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone or E-mail) may not be used for commercial purposes.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Meeting of March 17, 2010

MM/SC/TV/MS 6:0:3 Minutes approved as amended. Messrs. Finrow and Savage and Ms. Howard abstained.

040710.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040710.21 Washington Hall
153 14th Ave.

Proposed interior paint colors, and exterior banners and light fixtures

Mr. Abelsen recused himself.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, explained that the 3' x 6' temporary banner would hang on the front façade above the arched entrance. She said there would be no new penetrations and it would be strung from four corners attached to grommets attached inside through the windows. She went on to describe the proposed lighting and explained the new lights – a simple globe style – would be placed in the same location as shown in a 1937 photo of the building. She provided cut sheets for the light fixtures.

Responding to Board member questions, Kelton Johnson, Historic Seattle, explained that when the light is replaced any brick removed will be replaced and cleaned up and then repainted the red.

Ms. Woo explained the brick would be matched as best as possible. She said that the building was originally clad in wood siding and in 1918 changes were made and the brick was put in. She said they don't plan to remove the paint. She went on to explain the need for security lighting in the parking lot and said the three lights would have shields so as not to be intrusive to the adjacent apartments. The junction box will be surface mounted with two screws below the line of the window sill to make it less visible. The conduit will be attached to the building with pipe straps with one screw attached in the mortar joint.

Board discussion ensued regarding the finish on the conduit – that painting it would help to make it disappear or that it may come in a prefinished color that may work.

Ms. Woo noted it would be on a non-primary façade and she would send a photo of the conduit on the building to Ms. Chave for review.

Ms. Woo went over the interior paint and explained the muted color scheme for the 2nd floor auditorium/performance hall; Board members reviewed color samples. She explained the intent to create a “black box” feel noting the auditorium and balcony ceilings and the walls flanking the stage and

proscenium will all be the same dark color. She went over proposed paint colors for walls, wainscoting, and plaster walls for 2nd floor balcony and noted the drawing was keyed as to what colors would go where. She said window coverings would be submitted for review later.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said it was a temporary banner that would not be attached to the building. She said the exterior lighting was reasonable and that it was sympathetic to the historic structure. She said the security lighting was less of a concern since it would be on a non-primary façade. She supported the interior paint color noting it was neutral and could always be changed.

Ms. Howard agreed with Ms. Wirsching's comments.

Mr. Savage said it was a reasonable modification but noted the paint colors seemed dark.

Ms. Woo said the dark colors were chosen for the theater use – noting that they will put up theater lighting.

Mr. Luoma stated that the black color is reasonable in theaters because it allows for flexibility in lighting and props and said it was appropriate.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior paint colors, exterior light fixtures and temporary exterior banners, as per the applicant's submittal. The attachments into the wall for the light fixtures and conduit are to be installed into the mortar joints. The Board defers review and approval of any proposed changes to the temporary banners to Board staff. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Controls and Incentives agreement as the proposed changes do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, and the work can easily be removed without harming the historic structure, as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MW/CH 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Abelsen abstained.

040710.22

Garfield High School

400 23rd Ave.

Proposed replacement of two skylights over the current library space

Tom Bates, BLRB, provided photos of the recently completed major renovation project, and then went on to explain the need to replace the skylights due to leakage. He pointed out the rusted steel framing and that the skylights are currently wrapped in plastic to prevent water infiltration to the building. He reported that the original glazing had been replaced in the 1980s with plastic cellulose glazing. Mr. Bates went over the proposed replacement translucent Kalwal System that matches the profile of the existing window and will be painted to match existing; he said it matches all other replaced skylights. He explained that it is impact and vandal resistant as well as cost efficient and self-supporting – requiring no structural revisions. He pointed out the replacement skylight would be hipped. He explained that the replacement criteria is that the solution be energy efficient, vandal resistant, translucent (diffused light needed in a library) and cost effective, in addition to being sympathetic to the building.

Mr. Abelsen reported that ARC reviewed the application on Friday.

Responding to Board comments about the mullions on the proposed skylight being more widely spaced than what is existing Mr. Bale noted it would be as if every other mullion was removed from the existing skylight. He said the mullions on the proposed skylight were spaced every 4 12/’ and the mullions on the existing skylight were spaced at every 2’. He said that all skylights that have already been replaced at the building have been replaced with this system. In response to board questions Mr. Bates explained the new skylights would be painted to match what is there now – a beige color.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the load capacity.

Mr. Bates explained the system had been pre-engineered to carry its own load without adding weight.

Responding to board comments about designated features Ms. Chave explained the volume of the space and roof truss framing had been designated. Mr. Bates said that the wood floor remains and the carpet just floats on top.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching went over discussion at the ARC meeting about matching the historic system and trying to maintain the appearance from the interior. She

said there was no detailed discussion on the spacing of the mullions. She said ARC was comfortable with what was proposed and that it was not visible from outside.

Mr. Veith expressed concern about the loss of historic material noting other school gyms that had been lost entirely. He said he didn't want to lose the remaining features of the space but understood the School District's desires noting that the request was reasonable.

Ms. Chave said the drawings of existing versus proposed skylights were in the application packet.

Ms. Wine stated she had mixed feelings and noted the original space – thinner steel profiles and character defining – few elements in new space. She said the trusses had been penetrated by mechanical systems. She said the new system had a more monolithic look to it. She said the application was reasonable but noted it was a step of further conversion of a character defining feature.

Mr. Savage said he was happy to see the trusses and asked if a custom panel could be made that would match.

Mr. Bates said it could be done but it would cost a lot more money because it would be doubling the mullions and wouldn't fit the District budget.

Mr. Savage noted the substantial changes but it was an opportunity to save more original pieces; he said it was reasonable.

Mr. Finrow said he looked at the photo of the renovated commons and noted there were not as many mullions but there is lots of scale and texture. He said it is not exactly the same but there is an internal structure. He said the space below is altered. He said the change was reasonable. He noted the interface of energy efficiency and restoration of a historic building. He noted the difficulty of trying to replicate historic materials and said it was a good solution. He said he was please it was hipped as it was originally.

Mr. Abelsen said it was a reasonable solution but ideally the replacement skylight system would have matched the original better. He said he observed at Volunteer Park a similar, alternative design that achieved a close-to-original look. He said that while not ideal, the overall design of the system, using all new materials, was close to, although an abstract of the original, and was reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed replacement of two skylights over the current library space (former gymnasiums) as described in the application

submittal and submitted plans, with the condition that the interior skylight frame be painted to match the existing skylight frame. This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Report on Designation*: While the proposed change includes removal and replacement of a significant element (the skylights) in a designated interior space (the former gymnasiums), the existing glazing in the skylights is a plastic replacement glazing that not original. In addition, the new skylights will fit in the existing roof openings, and the profile and dimensions of the skylights will not change with this proposal. The new skylight glazing will not be visible from the public's view of the exterior of the landmark school.
2. *With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The proposed modifications to the skylights are reasonable in light of other alternatives.
4. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D are not applicable.

MM/SC/MS/MW 10:0:0 Motion carried.

040710.23

Terry Avenue Building

320 Terry Avenue North

Proposed change in replacement window design on the east and west facades

Rachel Ben-Schmuel, Vulcan, explained the proposal to change the windows on the east and west elevations. She said the windows on second story of the west elevation would be repaired and retrofitted while the storefront windows on the west elevation and the windows on the east elevation would be replaced. For the new windows, she said that true divided light windows were proposed with energy efficient glass.

Chuck Pautz of Callison, explained that they had determined the low iron glazing they had originally intended to use would not fit in the existing window muntins and also noted the brittle nature of the low iron glass which would make it impossible to use in a 1/8" dimension. He said they proposed to use Sungate 500 1/8" glass which has a slight green to it. He showed the comparison of the glass to others and noted that it had been used in other historic contexts. He said the mullion part will be closely replicated. He said the top row of windows on the west elevation would be refurbished and the bottom windows would be new. He said the upper level windows on the east

elevation would be replaced in kind with true divided light. He said glazing on both east and west elevations would be the same.

Mr. Hannum arrived at 4:50 p.m.

Board Question:

Responding to board questions Mr. Pautz explained the Sungate glass was proposed because it provided a higher light transmittance but that it was a little less energy efficient than the 1” and that they would have to get a variance. He noted that they had proposed operable windows.

Ms. Wine said she was glad true divided light windows would be used and noted it was a workable solution to have thinner glazing; she said it was an improvement.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Board Comment: Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JF/AL 8:0:2 Motion carried. Mr. Hannum abstained and Mr. Savage recused himself.

040710.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

040710.31 Brasa/Metropolitan Printing Press Building
2107 Third Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a six month extension.

Action: I moved that we extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Brasa/Metropolitan Printing Press Building for six months.

MM/SC/TV/MS 11:0:0 Motion carried.

040710.4 BOARD BUSINESS

040710.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator